assign that power to an individual? Nova Scotia had and has still a representative constitution, which was never forfeited by rebellion; can Parliament authorize an individual to make a Senate or Legislature for her? If Parliament can authorize a Governor General to do so, it may authorize any one else: If it can authorize LORD MONCK, why may it not authorize the PRESIDENT of the UNITED STATES, the EMPEROR OF CHINA, or the TYCOON of JAPAN, to manufacture a legislature for Nova Scotia?

When the Colonies were first settled, the King, having sovereign power, constituted systems of legislation for them. After constitutions were granted, the sovereign continued to appoint Legislative Councils. This was voluntarily submitted to, though by no means in accordance with the spirit of the constitution; but whenever elective Councils were demanded, they were, without dispute, conceded. But when the sovereign appointed these Councils, he did so *himself:* he never delegated the power to a subject. The power attaches to the person of the sovereign. The Queen cannot delegate it, and she can no more transfer this prerogative to a subject than she can transfer our allegiance to a subject. Before the Queen can transfer our allegiance to Lord Monck, we must be consulted, for there are two parties to the execution of such a bargain. The Queen might resign our allegiance, and set us free, but we must be consulted before we can become the subjects of Lord Monck. The Queen may be disposed to transfer to him the prerogative of appointing Senators for us, and may assent to an Act of Parliament, vesting that right in him, *as far as she can*, but he cannot exercise that prerogative until we have also passed a Statute of our Legislature, authorizing him to do so.

The Queen appoints Peers, and when appointed they become hereditary law-makers. The right is personal to the sovereign, and cannot be delegated to a subject. If this prerogative cannot be transferred to an individual, neither can it be transferred to any political body; and surely nothing could be more injudicious and dangerous to Her Majesty's supremacy over one Colony than an attempt to transfer this prerogative to another, and to authorize the one to tyrannize over the other. When George III. became hopelessly deranged in 1811, and the regency was conferred on the heir apparent, so completely and exclusively personal to the sovereign did Parliament consider this prerogative of creating peers, that they entrusted the Prince Regent with every other prerogative but this. If, then, it was thought unconstitutional to intrust it to the heir apparent to the throne, how could it be transferred to an inferior subject?

We will therefore take this exception to the Act, and with justice insist that the Governor-General cannot constitutionally make a Senate for Nova Scotia, without an Act of the Provincial Legislature, authorizing him to do so.

But we will oppose the Act on an incontrovertible ground—a ground which has been already decided—that taxation, without